Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
STATE OF NEW YORK))) WT Docket No. 06-18
Request for Waiver of Section 90.545)
Regarding 700 MHz Public Safety System)
Interference Protection for Co-Channel and)
Adjacent-Channel Television Stations)

COMMENTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The State of New York ("State") hereby submits the following comments in response to the Commission's *Public Notice*, DA 06-99, released January 26, 2006, seeking comments on the State's above-captioned Request for Waiver.¹

The *Public Notice* asks for comments as to whether the State's Request should be addressed within the context of a waiver, or as part of the broader Petition for Declaratory Ruling filed by Qualcomm, Incorporated.² The State is most concerned with obtaining authority as quickly as possible to initiate 700 MHz band public safety operations in the New York City area. There is a very real and critical need for this new public safety communications capability, as set forth in the Request. The form of Commission approval (*i.e.*, grant of a waiver or grant of a declaratory ruling) is less important than obtaining a rapid, favorable decision that promotes public safety and homeland security.

_

¹ On or about February 9, 2006, the State sent a letter to each of the television stations identified in the Request for Waiver and indicated the State's willingness to meet and discuss the details of the Request. The State received responses from three stations (WFUT, WMBC, and WFMZ) and has met by telephone or in person with each.

² See Public Notice, footnote 5.

Therefore, the State would support consideration of its Request within the context of the Qualcomm petition *only* if that would speed a favorable outcome. To the extent such a process could delay a Commission decision, the State would vigorously oppose it and urge separate and expeditious consideration of its Request for Waiver pursuant to Section 1.925 of the Commission's rules.

The Commission's *Public Notice* also seeks comment "on whether any waiver granted to New York should be conditioned on a commitment to correct any reported interference to TV or DTV reception, or if there are specific restrictions that we should otherwise impose to minimize such interference." The State is not opposed to a requirement that it make reasonable efforts to correct documented interference to TV or DTV reception clearly caused by its public safety operations. However, the State should not be required to respond to or solve every viewer's claim of interference, regardless of cause. There are any number of potential sources of "interference" in urban areas such as New York, and the State has neither the time nor the resources to address problems beyond its control. The State also notes that any interference that might occur to reception of channel 69 or channel 68 would be from mobile units and, therefore, extremely intermittent.

The State is not aware of any "specific restrictive conditions" to minimize interference that would be appropriate. The State reserves the right to address any such proposed conditions in its reply comments.³

-

³ Per discussions with Commission staff, the State is today filing a brief supplement to provide additional analysis of the interference potential to WFUT. As indicated therein, the additional analysis demonstrates even less potential for interference.

Respectfully submitted,

Hanford C. Thomas

Deputy Director

NYS Office for Technology State Capitol, ESP

P.O. Box 2062

Albany, New York 12220-0062

March 13, 2006